

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, DC., April 16, 1998.
Mr. RICHARD D. BENNETT,
Chief Counsel, Committee on Government Re-
form and Oversight, Rayburn House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: I am writing in re-
sponse to your letter of April 7, 1998, request-
ing the Department of Justice's position on
the granting of immunity to Larry Wong.
The Department of Justice has no opposition
to the Committee granting immunity to Mr.
Wong. We appreciate greatly your coordinat-
ing with us on this matter.

Sincerely,

MARK M. RICHARD,
Acting Assistant
Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, DC., April 16, 1998.
Mr. RICHARD D. BENNETT,
Chief Counsel, Committee on Government Re-
form and Oversight, Rayburn House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: I am writing in re-
sponse to your letter of April 7, 1998, request-
ing the Department of Justice's position on
the granting of immunity to Nancy Lee. The
Department of Justice has no opposition to
the Committee granting immunity to Ms.
Lee. We appreciate greatly your coordinat-
ing with us on this matter.

Sincerely,

MARK M. RICHARD,
Acting Assistant
Attorney General.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, DC., April 16, 1998.
Mr. RICHARD D. BENNETT,
Chief Counsel, Committee on Government Re-
form and Oversight, Rayburn House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BENNETT: I am writing in re-
sponse to your letter of April 7, 1998, request-
ing the Department of Justice's position on
the granting of immunity to Irene Wu. The
Department of Justice has no opposition to
the Committee granting immunity to Ms.
Wu. We appreciate greatly your coordinating
with us on this matter.

Sincerely,

MARK M. RICHARD,
Acting Assistant
Attorney General.

□ 2330

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COYNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. COYNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1998 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 1998 and for the 5-year period fiscal year 1998 through fiscal year 2002.

The term "current level" refers to the amount of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature as of April 21, 1998.

The first table in the report compares the current level of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by H. Con. Res. 84, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998 as adjusted pursuant to 314(b) of the Budget Act. This comparison is needed to implement section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 1998 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority, outlays, and new entitlement authority of each direct spending committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations for discretionary action made under H. Con. Res. 84 for fiscal year 1998 and for fiscal years 1998 through 2002. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority or entitlement authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 1998 with the revised "section 302(b)" sub-allocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. This comparison is also needed to implement section 302(f) of the Budget Act, because the point of order under that section also applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) sub-allocation. The revised section 302(b) sub-allocations were filed by the Appropriations Committee on March 31, 1998.

The fourth table compares discretionary appropriations to the levels provided by section

251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Section 251 requires that if at the end of a session the discretionary spending, in any category, exceeds the limits set forth in section 251(c) as adjusted pursuant to provisions of section 251(b), there shall be a sequestration of funds within that category to bring spending within the established limits. This table is provided for information purposes only. Determination of the need for a sequestration is based on the report of the President required by section 254.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1998 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 84 (Reflecting Action Completed as of March 31, 1998)

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year—	
	1998	1998–2002
Appropriate Level (as amended by P. L. 105–116):		
Budget Authority	1,405,449	7,386,233
Outlays	1,372,522	7,282,253
Revenues	1,199,000	6,477,552
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	1,389,663	NA
Outlays	1,374,198	NA
Revenues	1,197,381	6,459,901
Current Level over (+)/under (-) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	-15,786	NA
Outlays	1,676	NA
Revenues	-1,619	-17,651

NA=Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for Fiscal Years 1998 through 2002 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of any measure providing new budget authority for FY 1998 in excess of \$15,786 million (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 1998 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 84.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of any measure providing new outlays for FY 1998 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 1998 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 84.

REVENUES

Enactment of any measure that would result in any revenue loss for FY 1998 (if not already included in the current level estimate) or for FY 1998 through 2002 (if not already included in the current level) would cause revenues to fall further below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 84.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, April 21, 1998.

Hon. JOHN KASICH,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the on-budget current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, and estimated revenues for fiscal year 1998. These estimates are compared to the appropriate levels for those items contained in the 1998 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 84) and are current through April 1, 1998. A summary of this tabulation, my first for the second session of the 105th Congress, follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	House current level	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 84)	Current level +/- resolution
Budget Authority	1,389,663	1,405,449	- 15,786
Outlays	1,374,198	1,372,522	+ 1,676
Revenues:			
1998	1,197,381	1,199,000	- 1,619
1998-2002	6,459,901	6,477,552	- 17,651

Since my last report, dated November 6, 1997, nine authorization bills (Public Laws 105-85, 105-89, 105-92, 105-114, 104-124, 105-130, 105-135, 105-144, and 105-150) and six appropriation bills (Public Laws 105-78, 105-83, 105-86, 105-100, 105-118, and 105-119) have been enacted. These actions changed the current level of budget authority, outlays, and revenues. Detail is shown on the enclosed table.

In addition, the budget authority and outlay totals established in H. Con. Res. 84 have been revised to reflect additional appropriations that were enacted for payment of international arrearages, for the cost of continuing disability reviews, and for the dollar equivalent of Special Drawing Rights for the International Monetary Fund. These revisions increased the total budget authority

allocation by \$18,266 million and the total outlay allocation by \$61 million.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,
Director.

Enclosure.

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT: 105TH CONGRESS, 2ND SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS APRIL 1, 1998

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted			
Revenues			1,197,381
Permanents and other spending			
legislation	908,725	864,750	
Appropriation legislation	752,279	781,902	
Offsetting receipts	- 283,340	- 283,340	
Total previously enacted	1,377,664	1,363,312	1,197,381
Entitlements and Mandatories			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	11,999	10,886	
Total Current Level	1,389,663	1,374,198	1,197,381
Total Budget Resolution	1,405,449	1,372,522	1,199,000

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT: 105TH CONGRESS, 2ND SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS APRIL 1, 1998—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Amount remaining:			
Under Budget Resolution	15,786		1,619
Over Budget Resolution		1,676	
Addendum			
Emergencies	271	2,286	
Contingent Emergencies	300	75	
Total	571	2,361	
Total Current Level Including Emergencies	1,390,234	1,376,559	1,197,381

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: Amounts shown under "emergencies" represent funding for programs that have been deemed emergency requirements by the President and the Congress. Amounts shown under "contingent emergencies" represent funding designated as an emergency only by the Congress that is not available for obligation until it is required by the President and the full amount requested is designated as an emergency requirement.

Current level estimates include \$390 million in budget authority and \$298 million in outlays for projects that were canceled by the President pursuant to the Line Item Veto Act, Public Law 104-130.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 602(a) REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF SEPT. 9, 1997

[By fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	BA	1998 Outlays	NEA	BA	1998-2002 Outlays	NEA
HOUSE COMMITTEE						
Agriculture:						
Allocation						
Current Level				(2)	(2)	
Difference				(2)	(2)	
National Security:						
Allocation						
Current Level	(159)	(159)	9	(127)	(127)	101
Difference	(159)	(159)	9	(127)	(127)	101
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs:						
Allocation	(136)	(136)		(666)	(1,590)	
Current Level	(135)	(135)		(861)	(1,785)	
Difference	1	1		(195)	(195)	
Education and the Workforce:						
Allocation	(248)	(242)	1,726	(1,798)	(1,792)	12,867
Current Level	(462)	(239)	(456)	(1,834)	(1,791)	(1,801)
Difference	(214)	3	(2,182)	(36)	1	(14,668)
Commerce:						
Allocation			2,463	(26,313)	(26,313)	2,375
Current Level	4,275	4,275	4,405	(1,163)	(1,163)	9,891
Difference	4,275	4,275	1,942	25,150	25,150	7,516
International Relations:						
Allocation						
Current Level						
Difference						
Government Reform & Oversight:						
Allocation	(604)	(632)		(3,096)	(3,096)	
Current Level	(604)	(604)		(2,874)	(2,874)	
Difference		28		222	222	
House Oversight:						
Allocation						
Current Level	5	3		5	5	
Difference	5	3		5	5	
Resources:						
Allocation						
Current Level	14	3		19	19	
Difference	14	3		19	19	
Judiciary:						
Allocation	146	177		908	1,063	
Current Level				5	5	5
Difference	(146)	(177)		(903)	(1,058)	5
Transportation and Infrastructure:						
Allocation	29,695	65		156,356	1,209	
Current Level	29,586	70		28,850	(167)	
Difference	(109)	5		(127,506)	(1,376)	
Science:						
Allocation						
Current Level						
Difference						
Small Business:						
Allocation						
Current Level		2		22	16	
Difference		2		22	16	
Veterans Affairs:						
Allocation	(224)	(224)	327	(1,665)	(1,665)	5,773
Current Level	(115)	(207)	(41)	(638)	(728)	(2,050)
Difference	109	17	(368)	1,027	937	(7,823)
Ways and Means:						
Allocation	(5,918)	(5,918)	400	(113,146)	(113,149)	1,603
Current Level	(1,755)	(2,881)	500	(109,756)	(110,118)	2,030
Difference	4,163	3,037	100	3,390	3,031	427
Select Committee on Intelligence:						
Allocation						
Current Level						
Difference						
Total Authorized:						
Allocation	22,711	(6,910)	4,916	10,580	(145,333)	22,618
Current Level	30,650	128	4,417	(88,354)	(118,710)	8,176
Difference	7,939	7,038	(499)	(98,934)	26,623	(14,442)

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH SUBALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO BUDGET ACT SECTION 302(b)

[In millions of dollars]

	Revised 302(b) suballocations (March 3, 1998)				Current level reflecting action completed as of April 21, 1998				Difference			
	Discretionary		Mandatory		Discretionary		Mandatory		Discretionary		Mandatory	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Agriculture, Rural Development	13,757	14,000	35,048	35,205	13,751	13,997	35,048	35,205	-6	-3	0	0
Commerce, Justice, State	31,280	25,555	522	532	31,280	28,955	522	532	0	3,400	0	0
District of Columbia	855	554	0	0	855	554	0	0	0	0	0	0
Energy and Water Development	20,732	20,879	0	0	20,732	20,880	0	0	0	1	0	0
Foreign Operations	31,008	13,079	44	44	13,147	13,079	44	44	-17,861	0	0	0
Interior	13,797	13,707	55	50	13,799	13,707	55	50	2	0	0	0
Labor, HHS & Education	80,328	76,123	206,611	209,167	80,547	76,202	206,611	209,167	219	79	0	0
Legislative Branch	2,279	2,251	92	92	2,251	2,251	92	92	-28	0	0	0
Military Construction	9,183	9,862	0	0	9,183	9,862	0	0	0	0	0	0
National Defense	247,512	244,199	197	197	247,512	244,198	197	197	0	-1	0	0
Transportation	11,772	37,179	698	665	12,711	37,204	698	665	939	25	0	0
Treasury-Postal Service	12,735	12,502	12,713	12,712	12,866	12,713	12,712	12,712	131	111	0	0
VA-HUD-Independent Agencies	66,395	79,977	21,332	20,061	68,703	80,089	21,332	20,061	2,308	112	0	0
Reserve/Offsets	2,953	470	0	0	0	0	0	0	-2,953	-470	0	0
Grand total	544,586	550,337	277,312	278,725	527,337	553,591	277,312	278,725	-17,249	3,254	0	0

BEA—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LEVELS SET FORTH IN SEC. 251(c) OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AND EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT OF 1985

[In millions of dollars]

	Defense		Nondefense		Violent crime trust fund	
	BA	A	BA	A	BA	A
Statutory Caps ¹	269,000	267,124	253,506	285,686	5,500	4,833
Current Level	268,934	266,694	252,903	283,614	5,500	3,583
Difference	-66	-430	-603	-2,072	0	-1,250

¹ As adjusted pursuant to sec 251(b) of the BBEDCA.

H-1B VISAS: THE STEALTH WAY OF TAKING U.S. JOBS FROM WORKERS PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight, I understand the hour is late, but I think this is a very important issue.

We have a program which many Members of Congress are not familiar with. It is called the H-1B visa program. This program allows industries from this Nation to bring over mostly high-tech workers from other countries, 65,000 workers a year right now, for temporary jobs. They can stay here for 6 years.

This was a program that was established back in 1990 because we were being told that we had an anticipated shortage of scientists and of engineers. By the time this program was in place, the Berlin Wall had fallen and we did not have as much of a need in the defense industry for this kind of technical expertise.

But what ended up happening was many countries found out that they could go overseas, they could bring over computer programmers or re-programmers rather than train American workers, and we have seen throughout this country a propensity of what I would refer to as job shops, that is companies that are providing computer programmers to our industries. And our industries are laying off unbelievable numbers of American workers, and they are being replaced by these temporary foreign workers.

I think we are really headed down a tragic highway in this country. I would just want to point out to the Members

of the House that, as the technical and high-tech industry is beating the drum saying we have need to import workers, that we have really thousands upon thousands of students that are graduating from college every year, and we are just debating here on the floor of the House how we deal with the student loan program.

These students are graduating from college. They have large amounts of student loans to pay back and, in many instances, they find themselves waiting on tables because they cannot get jobs. They could be trained to take these jobs. They could be trained to do computer programming.

And, at the same time, we are hearing from the computer industry and many others that they have this high-tech labor shortage. The headlines across the Nation in our papers are telling a different story.

Let me just read something from the Wall Street Journal that just said, a steady drumbeat of layoff announcements in industry sectors that until recently have complained about personnel shortages. In the Silicon Valley, layoffs have occurred at Seagate Technology Incorporated, Silicon Graphics, Netscape Communications Corporation, Apple Computer Incorporated, Sybase Incorporated and others. Some firms have cut hiring plans; help wanted advertising has slumped since the start of the year. Elsewhere, high-tech giants are shedding staff.

Last week, again, according to the Wall Street Journal, Xerox Corporation announced the layoff of 9,000 people. Yet we want to import up to 95,000 workers a year from other countries and give them these jobs.

Something is wrong in America today. We have not had a debate as to the need for this.

The other difficulty is that here is a high-tech industry which prides itself on identifying and quantifying problems, yet they have not proven, according to the GAO, that, in fact, there is a shortage. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and myself asked the GAO to look into these claims, and we found out that the material that they are using to justify this claim is faulty.

Also, last week in the San Francisco Examiner, they ran an unprecedented series of letters from readers that are concerned about the alleged shortage of information technology workers. Their conclusion is that we are seeing age discrimination that is pushing into this high-tech sector, pushing many qualified American workers out of the marketplace. The employers want cheaper, more exploitable foreign workers.

And I would like to quote at length from some of these letters, because I think we here in Congress are too busy as we rush through our legislative schedule and we have not heard from these workers.

An older computer consultant has said, "At job fairs, many older people, including myself, are rudely treated by young recruiters from human resources. In one blatant case, I saw a recruiter from a major local computer manufacturer and software firm refuse to talk to anyone who looked like they were over 35. Résumés from older people were tossed in one pile, résumés from younger people were put on another pile with attached notes from a mini interview."

I would also like to talk about one worker who said he was being brought back to his former employer to do what